

United States Patent and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Abbress COMMISSIC CERC F PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS Washington Dec. 20231 www.nepto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09.678,996	10 04 2000	Bernard IIIy	33339/204662	4906
826	7590 03 14 2002			
ALSTON & BIRD LLP BANK OF AMERICA PLAZA 101 SOUTH TRYON STREET, SUITE 4000			EXAMINER	
			WONG, LESLIE A	
CHARLOTTE, NC 28280-4000			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			1761	6
			DATE MAILED: 03/14/2002	!

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

ZH 7

Office Action Summary

Application No. 09/678,996

Applicant(s)

Illy et al.

Examiner

Leslie Wong

Art Unit 1761

The MAILING DATE of this communication appear	s on the cover sheet with the correspondence address	
Period for Reply		
A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SE THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.		
- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37	CFR 1.136 (a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed	
after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this commun - If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) day be considered timely.	s, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will	
 If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory communication. 	period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this	
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, I	by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). The mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any	
Status		
1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on	· .	
2a) ☐ This action is FINAL . 2b) ☒ This ac	ction is non-final.	
3) Since this application is in condition for allowance closed in accordance with the practice under Ex p	except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is parte Quayle, 1935 C.D. 11; 453 O.G. 213.	
Disposition of Claims		
4) X Claim(s) 1-18	is/are pending in the application.	
4a) Of the above, claim(s)	is/are withdrawn from consideration.	
5) Claim(s)	is/are allowed.	
6) X Claim(s) 1-18	is/are rejected.	
7) Claim(s)	is/are objected to.	
8) Claims	are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.	
Application Papers		
9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.		
10) The drawing(s) filed on is/ar	re objected to by the Examiner.	
11) The proposed drawing correction filed on	is: a) \square approved b) \square disapproved.	
12) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Exam	niner.	
Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119		
13) \overline{X}^{\parallel} Acknowledgement is made of a claim for foreign	priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d).	
a) 💢 All b) 🗔 Some* c) 🗔 None of:		
1. $\overline{\chi}$ Certified copies of the priority documents ha	eve been received.	
2. Certified copies of the priority documents ha	eve been received in Application No	
application from the International Bur		
*See the attached detailed Office action for a list of t		
14) Acknowledgement is made of a claim for domesti	ic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e).	
Attachment(s)		
15) X Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)	18) [] Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s)	
16) 🗋 Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)	19) Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)	
17) 💢 Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s)5	20) Other:	

Application/Control Number: 09/678996

Art Unit: 1761

The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

Claims 1-18 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

Claims 1-18 are indefinite as to the use of "preferably", "for example", "in particular", "where appropriate", and "at least" as the use of these phrases does not clearly set forth the metes and bounds of the patent protection desired. The use of these phrases renders the claims indefinite by raising a question or doubt as to whether the feature introduced by such language is (a) merely exemplary of the remainder of the claims, and therefore not required, or (b) a required feature of the claims.

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 1-18 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Anderson and Burt in view of Winton.

Anderson discloses the molding of a dairy product where a mixture is cast, cooled, and reheated to unmold the product (see entire document, especially the abstract).

Application/Control Number: 09/678996 Page 3

Art Unit: 1761

Burt discloses the production of a frozen dairy product where a mixture is cast, cooled, reheated, unmolded, dipped, and packaged (see entire patent).

The claims differ as to the composition of the dairy product.

Winton discloses the conventional composition of cheese and ice cream where these amounts are the same as that claimed by Applicant (see pages 178-180 and 207).

It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art, at the time in the invention was made, to use the composition percents of Winton in that of either Anderson or Burt as the composition of dairy products is conventional and well-known in the art.

In the absence of unexpected results, it is not seen how the claimed invention differs from the teachings of the prior art. Applicant's claims are drawn to a combination of known components which produces expected results, see In re Kerkhoven 205 USPQ 1069 and In re Gershon 152 USPQ 602.

All of the claim limitations have been considered. None of them are seen as serving as basis for patentability.

No claim is allowed.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Leslie Wong whose telephone number is (703) 308-1979. The examiner can normally be reached on Tuesday-Friday.

The fax number for this Group is (703) 872-9310.

Art Unit 1761

LAW

March 8, 2002